	Bar Court of Californ Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION	nia
Counsel for the State Bar	Case Number(s): SBC-19-O-30066-YDR	For Court use only
Collin L. Grant Deputy Trial Counsel 845 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 765-1394	I	UBLIC MATTE FILED
State Bar # 311043		JUL 03 2019
In Pro Per Respondent Victor Waidor Luke Law Firm of V.W. Luke, APLC 1502 North Main Street Santa Ana, CA 92701 (714) 835-5091		STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES
	Submitted to: Settlement Ju	ıdge
State Bar # 193150	STIPULATION RE FACTS, O DISPOSITION AND ORDER	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND APPROVING
In the Matter of: VICTOR WAIDOR LUKE	ACTUAL SUSPENSION	
State Bar # 193150	☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATIO	ON REJECTED
(Respondent)		

Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, must be set forth in an attachment to this stipulation under specific headings, e.g., "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law," "Supporting Authority," etc.

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is an attorney of the State Bar of California, admitted December 9, 1997.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of **16** pages, not including the order.
- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."



1										
(5)	Cor Lav	nclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of v."								
(6)		e parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading apporting Authority."								
(7)		more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any ding investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.								
(8)		ment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 0.7. It is recommended that (check one option only):								
		Costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10, and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment. Unless the time for payment of discipline costs is extended pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 6086.10, costs assessed against an attorney who is actually suspended or disbarred must be paid as a condition of reinstatement or return to active status.								
		Costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment. SELECT ONE of the costs must be paid with Respondent's annual fees for each of the following years:								
		If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified in writing by the State Bar or the State Bar Court, the remaining balance will be due and payable immediately.								
		Costs are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs."								
		Costs are entirely waived.								
N	lisc	avating Circumstances [Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional onduct, standards 1.2(h) & 1.5]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are ired.								
(1)		Prior record of discipline:								
	(a)	State Bar Court case # of prior case:								
	(b)	☐ Date prior discipline effective:								
	(c)	Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:								
	(d)	Degree of prior discipline:								
	(e)	☐ If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.								
(2)		Intentional/Bad Faith/Dishonesty: Respondent's misconduct was dishonest, intentional, or surrounded by, or followed by bad faith.								
(3)		Misrepresentation: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, misrepresentation.								
(4)		Concealment: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, concealment.								

(Effective March 15, 2019)

(Do not wri	te above this line.)
(5)	Overreaching: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, overreaching.
(6)	Uncharged Violations: Respondent's conduct involves uncharged violations of the Business and Professions Code, or the Rules of Professional Conduct.
(7)	Trust Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.
(8)	Harm: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public, or the administration of justice.
(9)	Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of Respondent's misconduct. See page 12.
(10)	Candor/Lack of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of Respondent's misconduct, or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations or proceedings.
(11)	Multiple Acts: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing. See page 12.
(12)	Pattern: Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
(13)	Restitution: Respondent failed to make restitution.
(14)	Vulnerable Victim: The victim(s) of Respondent's misconduct was/were highly vulnerable.
(15)	No aggravating circumstances are involved.
Addition	al aggravating circumstances:
The second second second second second	pating Circumstances [Standards 1.2(i) & 1.6]. Facts supporting mitigating umstances are required.
(1)	No Prior Discipline: Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not likely to recur.
(2)	No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client, the public, or the administration of justice.
(3)	Candor/Cooperation: Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of Respondent's misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations and proceedings.
(4)	Remorse: Respondent promptly took objective steps demonstrating spontaneous remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of Respondent's misconduct.
(5)	Restitution: Respondent paid \$ on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
(6)	Delay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced Respondent.
(7)	Good Faith: Respondent acted with a good faith belief that was honestly held and objectively reasonable.

(Do no	ot write	e above this line.)
(8)		Emotional/Physical Difficulties: At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct,
		Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical or mental disabilities which expert testimony would establish were directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any illegal conduct by Respondent, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and the difficulties or disabilities no longer pose a risk that Respondent will commit misconduct.
(9)		Severe Financial Stress: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial stress resulting from circumstances which were not reasonably foreseeable or were beyond Respondent's control and were directly responsible for the misconduct.
(10)		Family Problems: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in Respondent's personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
(11)		Good Character: Respondent's extraordinarily good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of Respondent's misconduct.
(12)		Rehabilitation: Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
(13)		No mitigating circumstances are involved.
Addi	tiona	al mitigating circumstances:
		o Prior Record of Discipline, see page 13. retrial Stipulation, see page 13.
D. R	eco	mmended Discipline:
(1)		Actual Suspension:
		Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for , the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for with the following conditions.
		 Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for the first Respondent's probation.
(2)		Actual Suspension "And Until" Rehabilitation:
		Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for , the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for with the following conditions.
		 Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first of Respondent's probation and until Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)
(3)		Actual Suspension "And Until" Restitution (Single Payee) and Rehabilitation:
		Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for , the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for with the following conditions.

(Effective March 15, 2019)

wt 5-10-19

100	nat	Marrita	above	thic	lino 1
UDO	HUL	wille	above	ulis	IIIIE.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first
 of
 Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until both of the following
 requirements are satisfied:
 - a. Respondent makes restitution to or such other recipient as may be designated by the Office of Probation or the State Bar Court, in the amount of \$ plus 10 percent interest per year from (or reimburses the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5) and furnishes satisfactory proof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles; and
 - b. Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(4)		Actual Suspension	"And Until"	Restitution	(Multiple	Payees)	and Rehabilitation
-----	--	--------------------------	-------------	-------------	-----------	---------	--------------------

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for and Respondent is placed on probation for with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first of Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until both of the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a. Respondent must make restitution, including the principal amount plus 10 percent interest per year (and furnish satisfactory proof of such restitution to the Office of Probation), to each of the following payees or such other recipient as may be designated by the Office of Probation or the State Bar Court (or reimburse the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5):

Payee	Principal Amount	Interest Accrues From
1900		

- b. Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)
- (5) Actual Suspension "And Until" Restitution (Single Payee) with Conditional Std. 1.2(c)(1) Requirement:

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for **two years**, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for **two years** with the following conditions.

 Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum for the first 30 days of Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until the following requirements are satisfied:

6-10-19

(Effective March 15, 2019)

1	Da	not	write	above	thic	lino	١
(IJO	not	write	anove	Inis	line	1

- a. Respondent makes restitution to **Orange County Superior Court** or such other recipient as may be designated by the Office of Probation or the State Bar Court, in the amount of \$ 1,750 plus 10 percent interest per year from **January 15, 2018** (or reimburses the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5) and furnishes satisfactory proof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles; and.
- b. If Respondent remains suspended for two years or longer, Respondent must provide proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(6)	Actual Suspension "And Until"	" Restitution (Multiple Payees) with Conditional Std. 1.2	(c)(1)
	Requirement:		

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for , the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum for the first
 of
 Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until the following requirements are
 satisfied:
 - a. Respondent must make restitution, including the principal amount plus 10 percent interest per year (and furnish satisfactory proof of such restitution to the Office of Probation), to each of the following payees or such other recipient as may be designated by the Office of Probation or the State Bar Court (or reimburse the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5):

Payee	Principal Amount	Interest Accrues From
	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	30 30 30 30 30 40 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00

b. If Respondent remains suspended for two years or longer, Respondent must provide proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(7)		Actual	Suspension	with	Credit f	or	Interim	Suspensio	n:
-----	--	--------	------------	------	----------	----	---------	-----------	----

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for , the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for with the following conditions.

• Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for the first for the period of interim suspension which commenced on).

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

WT:-10-19

(Effective March 15, 2019)

- (1) Review Rules of Professional Conduct: Within 30 days after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must read the California Rules of Professional Conduct (Rules of Professional Conduct) and Business and Professions Code sections 6067, 6068, and 6103 through 6126. Respondent must provide a declaration, under penalty of perjury, attesting to Respondent's compliance with this requirement, to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles (Office of Probation) with Respondent's first quarterly report.
- (2) Comply with State Bar Act, Rules of Professional Conduct, and Probation Conditions: Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of Respondent's probation.
- (3) Maintain Valid Official State Bar Record Address and Other Required Contact Information: Within 30 days after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must make certain that the State Bar Attorney Regulation and Consumer Resources Office (ARCR) has Respondent's current office address, email address, and telephone number. If Respondent does not maintain an office, Respondent must provide the mailing address, email address, and telephone number to be used for State Bar purposes. Respondent must report, in writing, any change in the above information to ARCR, within ten (10) days after such change, in the manner required by that office.
- (4) Meet and Cooperate with Office of Probation: Within 15 days after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation case specialist to discuss the terms and conditions of Respondent's discipline and, within 30 days after the effective date of the court's order, must participate in such meeting. Unless otherwise instructed by the Office of Probation, Respondent may meet with the probation case specialist in person or by telephone. During the probation period, Respondent must promptly meet with representatives of the Office of Probation as requested by it and, subject to the assertion of applicable privileges, must fully, promptly, and truthfully answer any inquiries by it and provide to it any other information requested by it.
- (5) State Bar Court Retains Jurisdiction/Appear Before and Cooperate with State Bar Court: During Respondent's probation period, the State Bar Court retains jurisdiction over Respondent to address issues concerning compliance with probation conditions. During this period, Respondent must appear before the State Bar Court as required by the court or by the Office of Probation after written notice mailed to Respondent's official State Bar record address, as provided above. Subject to the assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must fully, promptly, and truthfully answer any inquiries by the court and must provide any other information the court requests.
- (6) Quarterly and Final Reports:
 - a. Deadlines for Reports. Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation no later than each January 10 (covering October 1 through December 31 of the prior year), April 10 (covering January 1 through March 31), July 10 (covering April 1 through June 30), and October 10 (covering July 1 through September 30) within the period of probation. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date and cover the extended deadline. In addition to all quarterly reports, Respondent must submit a final report no earlier than ten (10) days before the last day of the probation period and no later than the last day of the probation period.
 - b. Contents of Reports. Respondent must answer, under penalty of perjury, all inquiries contained in the quarterly report form provided by the Office of Probation, including stating whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act and the Rules of Professional Conduct during the applicable quarter or period. All reports must be: (1) submitted on the form provided by the Office of Probation; (2) signed and dated after the completion of the period for which the report is being submitted (except for the final report); (3) filled out completely and signed under penalty of perjury; and (4) submitted to the Office of Probation on or before each report's due date.

WT 6-10:19

- c. Submission of Reports. All reports must be submitted by: (1) fax or email to the Office of Probation; (2) personal delivery to the Office of Probation; (3) certified mail, return receipt requested, to the Office of Probation (postmarked on or before the due date); or (4) other tracked-service provider, such as Federal Express or United Parcel Service, etc. (physically delivered to such provider on or before the due date).
- d. Proof of Compliance. Respondent is directed to maintain proof of Respondent's compliance with the above requirements for each such report for a minimum of one year after either the period of probation or the period of Respondent's actual suspension has ended, whichever is longer. Respondent is required to present such proof upon request by the State Bar, the Office of Probation, or the State Bar Court.
- (7) State Bar Ethics School: Within one year after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of the State Bar Ethics School and passage of the test given at the end of that session. This requirement is separate from any Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for attending this session. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the Ethics School after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.
- (8) State Bar Ethics School Not Recommended: It is not recommended that Respondent be ordered to attend the State Bar Ethics School because
- (9) State Bar Client Trust Accounting School: Within one year after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of the State Bar Client Trust Accounting School and passage of the test given at the end of that session. This requirement is separate from any Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for attending this session. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the Client Trust Accounting School after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.
- (10) Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) Courses California Legal Ethics [Alternative to State Bar Ethics School for Out-of-State Residents]: Because Respondent resides outside of California, within after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must either submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of the State Bar Ethics School and passage of the test given at the end of that session or, in the alternative, complete hours of California Minimum Continuing Legal Education-approved participatory activity in California legal ethics and provide proof of such completion to the Office of Probation. This requirement is separate from any MCLE requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for this activity. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the Ethics School or the hours of legal education described above, completed after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.
- Criminal Probation: Respondent must comply with all probation conditions imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must report such compliance under penalty of perjury in all quarterly and final reports submitted to the Office of Probation covering any portion of the period of the criminal probation. In each quarterly and final report, if Respondent has an assigned criminal probation officer, Respondent must provide the name and current contact information for that criminal probation officer. If the criminal probation was successfully completed during the period covered by a quarterly or final report, that fact must be reported by Respondent in such report and satisfactory evidence of such fact must be provided with it. If, at any time before or during the period of probation, Respondent's criminal probation is revoked, Respondent is sanctioned by the criminal court, or Respondent's status is otherwise changed due to any



WT 6-10-19

and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter. Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension.

For purposes of compliance with rule 9.20(a), the operative date for identification of "clients being represented in pending matters" and others to be notified is the filing date of the Supreme Court order, not any later "effective" date of the order. (*Athearn v. State Bar* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 38, 45.) Further, Respondent is required to file a rule 9.20(c) affidavit even if Respondent has no clients to notify on the date the Supreme Court filed its order in this proceeding. (*Powers v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 337, 341.) In addition to being punished as a crime or contempt, an attorney's failure to comply with rule 9.20 is, inter alia, cause for disbarment, suspension, revocation of any pending disciplinary probation, and denial of an application for reinstatement after disbarment. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.20(d).)

(4) California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20 – Conditional Requirement: If Respondent remains suspended for 90 days or longer, Respondent must comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter. Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension. In addition, Respondent must also comply with the probation condition at paragraph E.(14) entitled Proof of Compliance with Rule 9.20 Obligations.

For purposes of compliance with rule 9.20(a), the operative date for identification of "clients being represented in pending matters" and others to be notified is the filing date of the Supreme Court order, not any later "effective" date of the order. (*Athearn v. State Bar* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 38, 45.) Further, Respondent is required to file a rule 9.20(c) affidavit even if Respondent has no clients to notify on the date the Supreme Court filed its order in this proceeding. (*Powers v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 337, 341.) In addition to being punished as a crime or contempt, an attorney's failure to comply with rule 9.20 is, inter alia, cause for disbarment, suspension, revocation of any pending disciplinary probation, and denial of an application for reinstatement after disbarment. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.20(d).)

- (5) California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20, Requirement Not Recommended: It is not recommended that Respondent be ordered to comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, because
- (6) Other Requirements: It is further recommended that Respondent be ordered to comply with the following additional requirements:

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

VICTOR WAIDOR LUKE

CASE NUMBER:

SBC-19-O-30066-YDR

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case No. SBC-19-O-30066-YDR (State Bar Investigation)

FACTS:

- 1. Respondent is the principal attorney at Law Offices of Victor W. Luke, APLC.
- 2. Respondent represented the plaintiff in *Masaoka v. A-American Self Storage Inc.*, Superior Court of California, County of Orange, case no. 30-2017-00934055-CU-BT-CJC.
- 3. On November 13, 2017, the Superior Court of California, County of Orange, ordered sanctions against Law Offices of Victor W. Luke, APLC in the sum of \$750 for respondent's failure to appear on October 23, 2017 and failure to file a Case Management Conference Statement. The court ordered respondent to pay the sanctions to the court by December 14, 2017. The court scheduled an Order to Show Cause for December 18, 2017 re: monetary sanctions in the amount of \$1,000 against respondent and for terminating sanctions. Respondent received the order. Respondent knew the November 13, 2017 order was final and binding.
- 4. Respondent did not pay the sanctions to the court by December 14, 2017, or at any point thereafter.
- 5. On December 18, 2017, the court ordered sanctions against Law Offices of Victor W. Luke, APLC in the sum of \$1,000 for respondent's failure to appear on November 13, 2017. The court ordered respondent to pay the sanctions to the court by January 15, 2018. Respondent received the order. Respondent knew the December 18, 2017 order was final and binding.
- 6. Respondent did not pay any sanctions amount to the court by January 15, 2018, or at any point thereafter.
- 7. Respondent failed to report the court's imposition of sanctions against respondent in the amount of \$1,000 to the State Bar by January 17, 2018.
- 8. On August 10, 2018, an investigator in the State Bar Office of Chief Trial Counsel mailed a letter of inquiry to respondent's membership records address. The letter of inquiry requested that respondent submit a written response to the allegations in the letter by August 24, 2018. Respondent received the August 10, 2018 letter, but failed to respond by August 24, 2018.



9. On August 27, 2018, the investigator mailed a letter of inquiry to respondent's membership records address requesting that respondent submit a written response to the State Bar's letter of inquiry by September 10, 2018. The investigator also enclosed a copy of the letter of inquiry mailed to respondent on August 10, 2018. Respondent received the August 27, 2018 letter, but failed to respond by September 10, 2018, or at any point thereafter.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

- 10. By failing to obey the court's November 13, 2017 order which required respondent to pay \$750 in monetary sanctions by December 14, 2017, in connection with *Masaoka v. A-American Self Storage Inc.*, Superior Court of California, County of Orange, case no. 30-2017-00934055-CU-BT-CJC, respondent disobeyed an order of the court requiring respondent do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of respondent's profession, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.
- 11. By failing to obey the court's December 18, 2017 order which required respondent to pay \$1,000 in monetary sanctions by January 15, 2018, in connection with *Masaoka v. A-American Self Storage Inc.*, Superior Court of California, County of Orange, case no. 30-2017-00934055-CU-BT-CJC, respondent disobeyed an order of the court requiring respondent do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of respondent's profession, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.
- 12. By failing to report to the State Bar, in writing, within 30 days of the time respondent had knowledge of the imposition of judicial sanctions against him on December 18, 2017, in the amount of \$1,000, in connection with *Masaoka v. A-American Self Storage Inc.*, Superior Court of California, County of Orange, case no. 30-2017-00934055-CU-BT-CJC, respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(o)(3).
- 13. By failing to provide a response to the State Bar's letters of inquiry dated August 10, 2018 and August 27, 2018 regarding the investigation of case no. 18-O-11040, respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against respondent, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(i).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent's conduct is aggravated by multiple acts of misconduct, including failure to obey two separate court orders, failure to report judicial sanctions, and failure to cooperate in a State Bar investigation.

Indifference toward Rectification of or Atonement for the Consequences of his or her Misconduct (Std. 1.5(k)): Respondent's continued violation of two court orders demonstrates respondent's indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his misconduct. During the disciplinary proceedings, respondent failed to appear without notice for multiple State Bar Court hearings, provided late and insufficient discovery responses to the Office of Chief Trial Counsel, and missed multiple deadlines related to trial.

WT 6-10-19

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Record of Discipline: Respondent was admitted on December 9, 1997 and has no prior record of discipline. Respondent's 19 years of discipline-free practice prior to the misconduct herein entitle respondent to mitigation. (See *In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49 [attorney's many years in practice with no prior discipline considered mitigating even when misconduct at issue was serious]; see also *Hawes v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 587, 596 [ten years of discipline free practice given "significant weight" in mitigation].)

Pretrial Stipulation: By entering into this stipulation, respondent has acknowledged misconduct and is entitled to mitigation for recognition of wrongdoing and saving the State Bar significant resources and time. (See *Silva-Vidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigative credit was given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability]; *In the Matter of Spaith* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 511, 521 [where the Review Department held that the attorney's stipulation to facts and culpability was a mitigating circumstance].) However, respondent's failure to participate during the investigation significantly tempers the mitigation available for his pretrial dispositive stipulation.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct "set forth a means for determining the appropriate disciplinary sanction in a particular case and to ensure consistency across cases dealing with similar misconduct and surrounding circumstances." (Rules Proc. Of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. For Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, Std. 1.1; hereinafter "Standards.") The Standards help fulfill the primary purposes of discipline, which include: protection of the public, the courts, and the legal profession; maintenance of the highest professional standards; and preservation of public confidence in the legal profession. (See, Std. 1.1; *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205.)

Although not binding, the Standards are entitled to "great weight" and should be followed "whenever possible" in determining level of discipline. (*In re Silverton* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 81, 92 (quoting *In re Brown* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 205, 220 and *In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 267, fn. 11).) Adherence to the Standards in the great majority of cases serves the valuable purpose of eliminating disparity and assuring consistency, that is, the imposition of similar attorney discipline for instances of similar attorney misconduct. (*In re Naney* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190.) If a recommendation is at the high end or low end of a Standard, an explanation must be given as to how the recommendation was reached. (Std. 1.1.) "Any disciplinary recommendation that deviates from the Standards must include clear reasons for the departure." (Std. 1.1; *Blair v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776 & fn. 5.)

In determining whether to impose a sanction greater or less than that specified in a given Standard, in addition to the factors set forth in the specific Standard, consideration is to be given to the primary purpose of discipline; the balancing of all aggravating and mitigating circumstances; the type of misconduct at issue; whether the client, public, legal system, or profession was harmed; and the member's willingness and ability to conform to ethical responsibilities in the future. (Stds. 1.7(b)-(c).)

Respondent violated two court orders requiring respondent to pay sanctions. In addition, respondent failed to report a sanction to the State Bar and failed to cooperate in a State Bar investigation. Respondent's misconduct is serious and respondent has not provided proof of payment or resolution of the outstanding debt. "Obedience to court orders is intrinsic to the respect attorneys and

wt 6-10-19 their clients must accord the judicial system." (In the Matter of Boyne (Review Dept. 1993) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 389, 403; see also Barnum v. State Bar (1990) 52 Cal.3d 104, 112 [violation of court order is considered serious misconduct].)

Standard 2.12(a) applies for respondent's violation of Business and Professions Code section 6103. Standard 2.12(a) provides that disbarment or actual suspension is the presumed sanction for disobedience or violation of a court order related to the member's practice of law.

Standard 2.12(b) applies for respondent's violation of Business and Professions Code sections 6068(o)(3) and 6068(i). Standard 2.12(b) provides that reproval is the presumed sanction for a violation of duties required of an attorney under sections 6068(i) and 6068(o).

Since respondent committed multiple acts of professional misconduct in violation of multiple Business and Professions Code sections, Standard 1.7(a) applies. Standard 1.7(a) states that if a member commits two or more acts of misconduct and the Standards specify different sanctions for each act, the most severe sanction must be imposed. Accordingly, disbarment or actual suspension is the appropriate discipline.

Respondent's 19 years of discipline-free practice prior to the misconduct entitles respondent to mitigation. However, respondent's multiple acts of misconduct and respondent's indifference toward rectification are aggravating factors. Respondent's sporadic participation in disciplinary proceedings demonstrates respondent's indifference to his professional obligations and a substantial risk to the public. Balancing respondent's misconduct and the mitigating and aggravating circumstances warrants two-years' stayed suspension, two-years' probation, and 30 days' actual suspension.

Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. __ [2018 WL 1586275 at p. 4] the Review Department found Collins culpable of five violations of Business and Professions Code section 6103 for Collins's failure to obey five separate court orders. The superior court ordered Collins to pay monetary sanctions totaling \$6,300, which Collins did not pay. Collins received discipline consisting of 30 days' actual suspension and two years' probation, including conditions that include payment of the sanctions ordered by the superior court. (*Id.* at p. 7.) (See *In the Matter of Respondent Y* (Review Dept. 1998) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 862, 869 [payment of outstanding sanctions is necessary component of discipline and ensures the attorney's professional obligations under B&P 6103]; see also *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 210-211 [payment of civil penalties ordered as explicit condition of probation despite any redundancies in civil enforcement action].) Collins's 22 years of discipline-free practice and pre-trial stipulation entitled Collins to mitigation, but multiple acts aggravated Collins' misconduct.

Similar to *Collins*, respondent failed to pay court-ordered sanctions and committed multiple acts of misconduct. Respondent had 19 years of discipline-free practice prior to the misconduct and enters into a pre-trial stipulation. In contrast, respondent only violated two court orders instead of five, but respondent also committed other misconduct and demonstrated indifference toward rectification. Accordingly, a level of discipline similar to *Collins* is appropriate.

Thus, the appropriate discipline includes two-years' stayed suspension, two-years' probation, and 30 days' actual suspension, and until respondent pays the superior court sanctions. Respondent must also complete State Bar Ethics School and both take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination. This discipline is sufficient to protect the public, the courts and the legal profession, maintain high professional standards, and preserve public confidence in the legal profession.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of June 6, 2019, the discipline costs in this matter are approximately \$8,264. Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

wT 6-10-19

n the Matter of:	Case Number(s):	
VICTOR WAIDOR LUKE	SBC-19-O-30066-YDR	
	and the control of th	

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

By their signatures below, the parties and their counsel, as applicable, signify their agreement with each of the recitations and each of the terms and conditions of this Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Disposition.

6/10/19	-///6	_ Victor Waidor Luke
Date / / /	Respondent's Signature	Print Name
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
6/11/19 Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Collin L. Grant
Date	Deputy That Counsel 3 Olghatale	Print Name

NT 570-19

In the Matter of:	Case Number(s):
VICTOR WAIDOR LUKE	SBC-19-O-30066-YDR

ACTUAL SUSPENSION ORDER

ipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED that the missal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without prejudice, and:
The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.

- \boxtimes The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- All Hearing dates are vacated.

On page 6 of the stipulation, paragraph a. at the top of the page is deleted, and in its place is inserted the following:

a. Respondent must pay to the Orange County Superior Court \$1,750 in sanctions imposed by the court in Masaoka v. A-American Self Storage Inc., Superior Court of California, County of Orange, case No. 30-2017-00934055-CU-BT-CJC and furnish satisfactory proof of such payment to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles; and,

The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved stipulation. (See Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.58(E) & (F).) The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after the filed date of the Supreme Court order. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.18(a).)

State Bar Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Court Specialist of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on July 3, 2019, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:

by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

VICTOR W. LUKE LAW FIRM OF V.W. LUKE, APLC 1502 N MAIN ST SANTA ANA, CA 92701

by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

COLLIN L. GRANT, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on July 3, 2019.

Mazie Yip Court Specialist State Bar Court